

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

No. 6:23-cv-00355

Jay Williams,
Plaintiff,

v.

United States Court,
Defendant.

ORDER

Plaintiff Jay Williams, an inmate at the Henderson County Jail, proceeding pro se, filed this lawsuit complaining of alleged violations of his rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love. On August 1, 2023, the magistrate judge issued a report recommending that this case be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). Doc. 4. The Magistrate Judge further recommended that no new lawsuits be accepted from plaintiff Jay Williams unless such lawsuit is filed by a licensed attorney enrolled to practice in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas and the full filing fee is paid at the outset of the case. Plaintiff has not filed an objection to the report and recommendation but has filed a handwritten coupon as an ostensible attempt at payment in this matter, as well a motion for release and a motion to change venue. Docs. 5, 6.

When there have been no timely objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the court reviews it only for clear error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996). Having reviewed the magistrate judge's report, and being satisfied that it contains no clear error, the court accepts its findings and recommendation.

Since May 1, 2023, plaintiff has filed thirty-three cases in this district alone.¹ He has neither paid a filing fee nor submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Plaintiff has been made aware that a handwritten “coupon” is not an acceptable form of payment and does not therefore affect the court’s screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. *See* Case No. 6:23-cv-00258 (Doc. 3). Moreover, plaintiff has been repeatedly warned of the frivolous nature of his allegations, and has, as a result, accumulated three strikes pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and *Adepegba v. Hammons*, 103 F.3d 383 (5th Cir. 1996), *abrogated in part on other grounds by Coleman v. Tollefson*, 575 U.S. 532, 534–41 (2015).


In addition, plaintiff’s filings now include direct attacks on the federal judiciary and its judges. At this point, plaintiff has sued every judge in the Tyler Division as well as the United States Courts. *See, e.g.*, 6:23-cv-298, 6:23-cv-354, 6:23-cv-355. Consuming scarce judicial time and resources with dozens of blatantly false accusations is a plain example of abuse of the judicial process. The court agrees that this conduct is sanctionable, and the court finds that the appropriate time to impose sanctions has arrived. *See Matter of United Markets Int’l, Inc.*, 24 F.3d 650 (5th Cir.1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 946 (1994); *Vinson v. Heckmann*, 940 F.2d 114 (5th Cir. 1991).

Accordingly, this case is dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). The dismissal of this action under § 1915A(b)(1) counts as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). *See Adepegba*, 103 F.3d at 388. Furthermore, it is ordered that no new lawsuits be accepted from plaintiff Jay Williams unless such lawsuit is filed by a licensed attorney enrolled to practice in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas and the full

¹ The case numbers are: 6:23-cv-211, 6:23-cv-212, 6:23-cv-213, 6:23-cv-214, 6:23-cv-215, 6:23-cv-216, 6:23-cv-217, 6:23-cv-218, 6:23-cv-219, 6:23-cv-220, 6:23-cv-221, 6:23-cv-222, 6:23-cv-223, 6:23-cv-224, 6:23-cv-225, 6:23-cv-226, 6:23-cv-227, 6:23-cv-228, 6:23-cv-229, 6:23-cv-230, 6:23-cv-236, 6:23-cv-256, 6:23-cv-257, 6:23-cv-258, 6:23-cv-260, 6:23-cv-263, 6:23-cv-287, 6:23-cv-298, 6:23-cv-300, 6:23-cv-301, 6:23-cv-353, 6:23-cv-354, and 6:23-cv-355.

filing fee is paid at the outset of the case. *See, e.g., Flores v. U.S. Dep't of Just.*, No. 5:21-cv-11, 2021 WL 8055537, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 4, 2021), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. 5:21-cv-11, 2022 WL 1105671 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 13, 2022). All motions pending in this civil action are denied.

So ordered by the court on September 12, 2023.



J. CAMPBELL BARKER
United States District Judge